

chemicals are being emitted in their neighborhoods.

There are still other areas in which we were unable to reach agreement. These are, in many cases, the lost opportunities of the first session of this Congress. It is my hope that we will be able to put aside our differences and recapture those opportunities this year.

Perhaps the greatest of these lost opportunities is welfare reform. We had the ability to change welfare, as we say, from a way of life to a way out. We had more than an opportunity; we had a bill. We passed a good, workable bill in this Senate that would have given people on welfare a real chance to support themselves and their families. But we lost that opportunity when extremism once again reared its ugly head in conference. I hope we will have the chance this year to correct that mistake.

Another lost opportunity is the anti-terrorism legislation we passed in the Senate; 9 months after Oklahoma City, that legislation languishes in the House for reasons unknown.

As the majority leader indicated, Democrats opposed the balanced budget amendment put forth last year by Republicans because it would have used Social Security funds to pay off Washington's debts and hide the real size of our deficit. We regard that amendment as yet another opportunity lost. The American people are ready—in fact they are demanding—that we deal with the deficit honestly.

The 1st session of the 104th Congress, represented a number of disappointments. We are disappointed, frankly, that we did not pass welfare reform that promotes work and protects children. We are disappointed that we did not pass a minimum wage law, long overdue. We are disappointed that we did not pass even a minimum health reform package. We are disappointed we did not pass the campaign finance reform bill that should have been passed a long time ago. We are disappointed we did not pass meaningful farm legislation. The farm bill has been pending and we are well into the new crop year and farmers still wonder what the farm policy will be even as they begin to plant for the 1996 season.

We are hopeful in the coming months we can deal with these disappointments in the same bipartisan fashion we dealt with issues from unfunded mandates to Bosnia. I remain willing to work with my colleagues, the majority leader, and all of my colleagues on the Republican side to ensure that we achieve the kinds of successes we are capable of in the second session of this Congress. I yield the floor.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Chair now wishes to advise the Senate under the previous order there was now to be a period for the transaction of morning business not to

exceed beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business be extended and the time allowed to each Member be extended to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION VETO

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep concern over the President's veto of the defense authorization bill and to state very clearly why I am not convinced that ratification of the START II Treaty is in the best interests of the United States national security.

At the heart of both of these matters is the issue of national missile defense and whether we are really serious about defending our Nation and the American people against ballistic missile attack. As I have stated many times on this floor, I am serious about this issue. I think there is no higher priority for our Nation's overall defense posture than the issue of national missile defense.

The threat is a very real threat. I have stated several times on this floor and quoted many people who are the experts who understand and evaluate what the threats are around the world. Certainly, the former CIA Director, James Woolsey, is in a position to know and to evaluate what a threat is to our Nation. That is what he did for a living. He was appointed by this President. He stated that he knows of between 20 and 25 nations that have or are developing weapons of mass destruction—either chemical, biological, or nuclear—and are developing the missile means of delivering these weapons.

In addition to that, we know that North Korea—with its development of the Taepo Dong II missile—is going to be capable of reaching Hawaii and Alaska by the year 2000 and the continental United States by the year 2002. Yet all we are talking about in the defense authorization bill is to develop a national missile defense system by the year 2003, not even meeting the time that missiles would be able to reach the continental United States. Many people like to speak of social programs and priorities almost as if national defense no longer matters now that the cold war is over. Yet I am convinced more every day that the threat facing the United States is in many ways greater now than it was when we had only two superpowers that we could identify. Right now we have Libya, Syria, Iran, Iraq, and many other nations that are developing the kind of destructive weapons and missile technology that pose a direct threat to our country.

I suggest also that when the President and others try to use such terms as "star wars," are grossly misleading

the American people, trying to make it appear not only that the prospect of a real and affordable missile defense is somehow a fantasy but also that the threat itself is a mythical thing that is not real, not something that we need to be even remotely concerned about. But they are wrong, Mr. President. They are living in the past. They do not realize that today's advancing weapons and missile technology are not the same as what they were 10 years ago when they might not have been so imminent a threat affecting our Nation's security. Today it is there and it is not to be taken lightly by those charged with responsibility for defending America.

We have an investment in this country of over \$38 billion in just the Aegis system. The Aegis is an existing system of naval ships that have advanced capabilities for both air and missile defense. For an additional investment of just \$4 to \$5 billion over several years, we could have a very basic and limited national missile defense capability ready to deploy in that short period of time that was called for in our defense authorization bill.

That has now been vetoed. It was vetoed for one major reason, and that is the President stated that it would be in violation of the ABM Treaty. But as others have pointed out previously, the bill was specifically crafted so as not to violate the treaty. Instead, it merely suggested that the President be urged to negotiate cooperative arrangements with Russia to allow us to proceed with necessary missile defense programs.

Now, Mr. President, I think it is important to realize the President is saying that we do not have a high priority on our Nation's missile defense system. The ABM Treaty was put in place back in 1972 during the Nixon administration. The architect of that treaty was Henry Kissinger. Dr. Kissinger at that time felt that this policy of mutual assured destruction was something that was worthwhile in that we had two superpowers and it put us each in a vulnerable position. Since we would not be able to defend ourselves, and the other side would be in the same position, it was thought that this would be some kind of an advantage in providing strategic stability. I did not agree with it at the time but nonetheless that is what was adopted.

I think it is interesting to remember what was stated not too long ago by Dr. Kissinger when we asked him the question, publicly, on public record: You were the architect of the ABM Treaty back when the ABM Treaty was put in place, and you felt this was something that was in the best interests of this country; what about today, now that we have the proliferation of missiles and of weapons of mass destruction? He said it does not make any sense anymore. He said in a direct quote, "It is nuts to make a virtue out of our vulnerability."

Mr. President, that is exactly what we have done when we hold up the

ABM Treaty as the cornerstone of U.S. strategic defense policy as this administration has done. The President has stated in his veto message that there is a linkage between the ABM Treaty and the START II Treaty. He says the Congress' determination to proceed with national missile defense "puts U.S. policy on a collision course with the ABM Treaty," and "puts at risk Russian ratification of the START II Treaty." I reject the notion that we should adopt some type of a treaty—in this case the START II Treaty—just in order to protect the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

I am aware that there is broad support in this body for ratification of the START II Treaty. I understand it. I expect the final vote to be overwhelmingly in favor. That vote may be a 98 to 1 vote and I may be the 1, but I would be compelled to speak out and at least let the American people realize how significant an issue this is.

There are a lot of reasons to be concerned about the merits of the START II Treaty. You could talk about compliance, the fact that the Russians' past record does not inspire a lot of confidence. We could talk about verification. Many provisions would be difficult to verify in the very best of circumstances. We could talk about the SS-18 MIRV'd missiles, and the fact that this would not actually do away with the launch facilities for these destructive multiwarhead missiles. We could talk about the downloading provisions and the fact that, in many cases, it does not require that you do away with the missile. It merely requires that you download it. And if you download it, then you can turn around and upload it.

Yet for all of these concerns, I don't seek to go into great detail. But what I will be addressing is what it does as far as the ABM Treaty is concerned and how it impacts our ability to proceed with the kind of national missile defense we need. This is what is most important.

I agree with Dr. Kissinger that the ABM Treaty is something that outlived its usefulness and no longer should be effective today. And, while I respect the views of some of my colleagues who are saying we now have managers' amendments that address all of these problems, I do not think these managers' amendments really do address them. For one thing, they do not change the treaty itself. All they are is advice by the Senate. I agree that those nine provisions of the managers' amendments are good and they make the Senate's understanding of the treaty much clearer. Unfortunately, they are not a part of the treaty.

I think we should recognize, finally, Mr. President, that they underwent some parliamentary elections in Russia on December 17. The Communists got 22 percent of the vote gaining seats and renewed influence. We now have the Communists at 157 seats in the Duma. Then you have Boris Yeltsin's party. Then there is a very interesting indi-

vidual by the name of Vladimir Zhirinovsky, from the ultranationalist party that is now No. 3, close behind the party that we were hoping would stay in power.

So it is a changed situation that we have today. And, of course, none of us can predict the future with certainty. But I come back to a simple proposition. Missile defense is among our highest national security priorities. If the President believes this priority must be sacrificed to gain Russia's approval of START II, then I would suggest it is too high a price to pay. This is why I believe it is imperative to resolve the impasse over the Defense authorization bill before we move to final approval of the START II Treaty.

Therefore, today, I am joined by Senator BOB SMITH in sending a letter to the majority leader stating we will object to proceeding to final action on the START II Treaty until an arrangement has been made with the Clinton administration enabling the people of America to be defended against missile attack. I believe this a prudent and justified course of action and I would urge my colleagues to concur.

Finally, if there were other individuals who had been with me in Oklahoma City on April 19, where we observed the results of the most devastating domestic bombing in the history of this country, they might begin to understand what is at stake. There at the Murrah Federal Office Building, we saw the destruction and had heard the cries of the individuals who were in there trapped and injured. And, of course, so many died—169 brave Oklahomans and wonderful people; citizens, who were not guilty of anything. They were killed without warning and without provocation for no apparent reason. This is modern terrorism at its worst. But if you just multiply that tragedy by 100 or 200 or 300, you can only begin to imagine what type of impact a future missile attack might have on a major American city.

The threat is there. The threat is more imminent than many realize. It is a very real threat. And I do not think there is anything this body will be engaged in, in discussing and putting into effect, that has a greater significance for our future security, than developing a national missile defense system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

#### A BULLY IN CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all I commend Senator DOLE and those leaders on the other side of the aisle who yesterday made it possible to pass a clean CR. I am sorry we did not do it sooner. I wish it had been done sooner. But I commend and applaud the Republican leadership and those Members of the Senate who allowed this to go forward.

Mr. President, I grew up in a small town in southern Nevada. When I was in the eighth grade, there were six kids in the class. That was one of our bigger classes. In the school at that time there was a bully. He was an eighth-grader and everyone in the school was afraid of him. If they were not afraid of him they worked something out with him, so that they could live with him.

We rarely had new people come to school there, but there was a young boy who came to school, an eighth-grader, somewhat small in stature, who came from someplace in Arizona. His name was Gary. He was a quiet young lad. And he was pushed around by this bully for 3 or 4 days, a week, 2 weeks. Finally this young man said I have had enough of this and we are going to settle this. And this young boy agreed to fight the big bully. Everyone knew the bully would win, everyone except Gary. And they engaged in fisticuffs and the young man, like one of the heroes in the books we read as young kids, won the fight. The bully was all through. He no longer pushed anyone around.

The reason I mention that, we kind of have a bully running around Congress. It is in the form of 73 Republican freshman Congressmen. They have suddenly gotten the stature that they can push everybody around. Mr. President, there are 535 Members of Congress, 435 House Members. It seems to me that leaves about 360-plus Members of the House who should be able to do pretty much what they want to do. Mr. President, 73 should not be a bully make; 73 should no longer be able to push a body of 535 people around. The time has come, as when Gary came to Searchlight Elementary School many, many years ago, to stand up for what is right.

What is right is to allow people to go to work and to be paid for working. I think it is absolutely unreasonable and unconscionable that the American taxpayer would be told: Yes, we are going to pay these people someday in the future. We are going to pay them, but they do not have to work for the pay.

Please, somebody tell me how that is rational? How is that reasonable? We are saying, "Go ahead and stay home, do not work, and we will pay you anyway?"

Or, we have another deal floating around. You can come back to work but you cannot buy any pencils, cannot buy any gas for cars. You basically cannot do anything.

Mr. President, I suggest that people of good will, both Democrats and Republicans, should follow the lead of the Republican leadership in the Senate, what took place in this body yesterday, and do what is right. What is right is to pass a clean CR and get on with our business. Allow people to go back to work.

Some people say an ongoing Government shutdown is a good thing. I say, tell that to people who want to get a visa to come to the United States. Thousands of them every day want to do that and they cannot do that. Does